arXiv:1408.2240v1 [math.RA] 10 Aug 2014

d-Hermite rings and skew PBW extensions

Oswaldo Lezama
jolezamas@unal.edu.co
Claudia Gallego
Seminario de Álgebra Constructiva - SAC^2
Departamento de Matemáticas
Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Bogotá

Abstract

Many rings and algebras arising in quantum mechanics can be interpreted as skew PBW (Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt) extensions. Indeed, Weyl algebras, enveloping algebras of finite-dimensional Lie algebras (and its quantization), Artamonov quantum polynomials, diffusion algebras, Manin algebra of quantum matrices, among many others, are examples of skew PBW extensions. In this short paper we study the d-Hermite condition about stably free modules for skew PBW extensions. For this purpose, we estimate the stable rank of these non-commutative rings. In addition, and close related with these questions, we will prove the Kronecker's theorem about the radical of finitely generated ideals for some particular types of skew BW extensions.

Key words and phrases. d-Hermite rings, skew PBW extensions, stable range theorem, Kronecker's theorem.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 16D40. Secondary: 15A21.

1 Introduction

Skew PBW extensions are a class of non-commutative rings and algebras of polynomial type that generalize classical PBW extensions and include many important types of quantum algebras. Skew PBW extensions were defined in [7], and some homological properties of them were investigated in [9]. In particular, if the ring of coefficients satisfies some suitable conditions, then the finitely generated projective modules over a skew PBW extension are stably free. However, it is easy to present examples of skew PBW extensions that are not Hermite rings (a ring S is *Hermite* if every stably free module is free). In fact, if K is a division ring, then $S := K[x, y]$ is a trivial skew PBW extension that has a module M such that $M \oplus S \cong S^2$, but M is not free, i.e., S is not Hermite ([6], p. 36). Another example occurs in Weyl algebras: Let K be a field, with $\text{char}(K) = 0$, the Weyl algebra $A_1(K) = K[t][x; \frac{d}{dt}]$ is a skew PBW extension but is not Hermite since there exist stably free modules of rank 1 over $A_n(K)$ that are not free ([2], Corollary 1.5.3; see also [12], Example 11.1.4). In this paper we will study a weaker condition than the Hermite property for skew PBW extensions: the d-Hermite condition.

Some notations and well known elementary properties of linear algebra for left modules are needed in the rest of the paper. The reader can see also [8]. If nothing contrary is assumed, all modules in this paper are left modules. Let S be a ring, S satisfies the *rank condition* ($\mathcal{RC}$) if for any integers $r, s \geq 1$, given an epimorphism $S^r \xrightarrow{f} S^s$, then $r \geq s$. S is an $\mathcal{IBN}$ ring (*invariant basis number*) if for any integers $r, s \geq 1$, $S^r \cong S^s$ if and only if $r = s$. It is well known that $\mathcal{RC}$ implies $\mathcal{IBN}$. From now on we will assume that all rings considered in the present paper are $\mathcal{RC}$. Let M be an S-module and $t \geq 0$ an

integer. M is *stably free of rank* $t \geq 0$ if there exist an integer $s \geq 0$ such that $S^{s+t} \cong S^s \oplus M$. It says that a ring S is *Hermite*, property denoted by $\mathcal{H}$, if every stably free S-module is free. Let F be a matrix over S of size $r \times s$. Then

(i) For $r \geq s$, F is *unimodular* if and only if F has a left inverse.

(ii) For $s \geq r$, F is *unimodular* if and only if F has a right inverse.

The set of unimodular column matrices of size $r \times 1$ is denoted by $Um_c(r, S)$. $Um_r(s, S)$ is the set of unimodular row matrices of size $1 \times s$. The unimodular vector $\boldsymbol{v} := \begin{bmatrix} v_1 & \dots & v_r \end{bmatrix}^T \in Um_c(r, S)$ is called *stable* (*reducible*) if there exists $a_1, \dots, a_{r-1} \in S$ such that $\boldsymbol{v}' := \begin{bmatrix} v_1 + a_1 v_r & \dots & v_{r-1} + a_{r-1} v_r \end{bmatrix}^T$ is unimodular. It says that the *left stable rank* of S is $d \geq 1$, denoted $\mathrm{sr}(S) = d$, if d is the least positive integer such that every unimodular column vector of length $d+1$ is stable. It says that $\mathrm{sr}(S) = \infty$ if for every $d \geq 1$ there exits a non stable unimodular column vector of length $d+1$. In a similar way is defined the right stable rank and it is well known that the stable rank condition is left-right symmetric.

We conclude this preliminary section with a result due Stafford about stably free modules. A matrix constructive proof can be found in [13], and also in [8].

Proposition 1.1. *Let S be a ring. Then any stably free S-module M with* $\mathrm{rank}(M) \geq \mathrm{sr}(S)$ *is free with dimension equals to* $\mathrm{rank}(M)$.

2 Skew PBW extensions

In this section we recall the definition of skew PBW (Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt) extensions defined firstly in [7], and we will review also some basic properties about the polynomial interpretation of this kind of non-commutative rings. Two particular subclasses of these extensions are recalled also.

Definition 2.1. *Let R and A be rings. We say that A is a skew PBW extension of R (also called a $\sigma - PBW$ extension of R) if the following conditions hold:*

(i) $R \subseteq A$.

(ii) *There exist finite elements $x_1, \dots, x_n \in A$ such A is a left R-free module with basis*

$$\mathrm{Mon}(A) := \{x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n} \mid \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n\}.$$

(iii) *For every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $r \in R - \{0\}$ there exists $c_{i,r} \in R - \{0\}$ such that*

$$x_i r - c_{i,r} x_i \in R. \tag{2.1}$$

(iv) *For every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ there exists $c_{i,j} \in R - \{0\}$ such that*

$$x_j x_i - c_{i,j} x_i x_j \in R + Rx_1 + \cdots + Rx_n. \tag{2.2}$$

Under these conditions we will write $A := \sigma(R)\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$.

The following proposition justifies the notation and the alternative name given for the skew PBW extensions.

Proposition 2.2. *Let A be a skew PBW extension of R. Then, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exists an injective ring endomorphism $\sigma_i : R \to R$ and a σ_i-derivation $\delta_i : R \to R$ such that*

$$x_i r = \sigma_i(r) x_i + \delta_i(r),$$

for each $r \in R$.

Proof. See [7], Proposition 3. □

A particular case of skew PBW extension is when all derivations δ_i are zero. Another interesting case is when all σ_i are bijective and the constants c_{ij} are invertible. We recall the following definition (cf. [7]).

Definition 2.3. *Let A be a skew PBW extension.*

(a) *A is quasi-commutative if the conditions (iii) and (iv) in Definition 2.1 are replaced by*

(iii') *For every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $r \in R - \{0\}$ there exists $c_{i,r} \in R - \{0\}$ such that*

$$x_i r = c_{i,r} x_i. \tag{2.3}$$

(iv') *For every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ there exists $c_{i,j} \in R - \{0\}$ such that*

$$x_j x_i = c_{i,j} x_i x_j. \tag{2.4}$$

(b) *A is bijective if σ_i is bijective for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $c_{i,j}$ is invertible for any $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.*

Some useful properties of skew PBW extensions that we will use later are the following.

Proposition 2.4. *Let A be a skew PBW extension of a ring R. If R is a domain, then A is a domain.*

Proof. See [9]. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let A be a quasi-commutative skew PBW extension of a ring R. Then,*

(i) *A is isomorphic to an iterated skew polynomial ring of endomorphism type, i.e.,*

$$A \cong R[z_1; \theta_1] \cdots [z_n; \theta_n].$$

(ii) *If A is bijective, then each endomorphism θ_i is bijective, $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof. See [9]. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let A be an arbitrary skew PBW extension of R. Then, A is a filtered ring with filtration given by*

$$F_m := \begin{cases} R & \text{if } \ m = 0 \\ \{f \in A \mid \deg(f) \leq m\} & \text{if } \ m \geq 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

and the corresponding graded ring $Gr(A)$ is a quasi-commutative skew PBW extension of R. Moreover, if A is bijective, then $Gr(A)$ is a quasi-commutative bijective skew PBW extension of R.

Proof. See [9]. □

Proposition 2.7 (Hilbert Basis Theorem)**.** *Let A be a bijective skew PBW extension of R. If R is a left (right) Noetherian ring then A is also a left (right) Noetherian ring.*

Proof. See [9]. □

Since the objects studied in the present paper are the skew PBW extensions, it is necessary to guarantee the $\mathcal{IBN}$ and $\mathcal{RC}$ properties for these rings.

Lemma 2.8. *Let B be a filtered ring. If $Gr(B)$ is $\mathcal{RC}$ ($\mathcal{IBN}$), then B is $\mathcal{RC}$ ($\mathcal{IBN}$).*

Proof. Let $\{B_p\}_{p\geq 0}$ be the filtration of B and $f : B^r \to B^s$ an epimorphism. For $M := B^r$ we consider the standard positive filtration given by

$$F_0(M) := B_0 \cdot e_1 + \cdots + B_0 \cdot e_r,\ F_p(M) := B_p F_0(M),\ p \geq 1,$$

where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^r$ is the canonical basis of B^r. Let $e'_i := f(e_i)$, then B^s is generated by $\{e'_i\}_{i=1}^r$ and $N := B^s$ has an standard positive filtration given by

$$F_0(N) := B_0 \cdot e'_1 + \cdots + B_0 \cdot e'_r,\ F_p(N) := B_p F_0(N),\ p \geq 1.$$

Note that f is filtered and strict: In fact, $f(F_p(M)) = B_p f(F_0(M)) = B_p(B_0 \cdot f(e_1) + \cdots + B_0 \cdot f(e_r)) = B_p(B_0 \cdot e'_1 + \cdots + B_0 \cdot e'_r) = B_p F_0(N) = F_p(N)$. This implies that $Gr(M) \xrightarrow{Gr(f)} Gr(N)$ is surjective. If we prove that $Gr(M)$ and $Gr(N)$ are free over $Gr(B)$ with bases of r and s elements, respectively, then from the hypothesis we conclude that $r \geq s$ and hence B is $\mathcal{RC}$.

Since every $e_i \in F_0(M)$ and $F_p(M) = \sum_{i=1}^r \oplus B_p \cdot e_i$, M is filtered-free with filtered-basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^r$, so $Gr(M)$ is graded-free with graded-basis $\{\overline{e_i}\}_{i=1}^r$, $\overline{e_i} := e_i + F_{-1}(M) = e_i$ (recall that by definition of positive filtration, $F_{-1}(M) := 0$). For $Gr(N)$ note that N is also filtered-free with respect the filtration $\{F_p(N)\}_{p\geq 0}$ given above: Indeed, we will show next that the canonical basis $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^s$ of N is a filtered basis. If $f_j = x_{j1} \cdot e'_1 + \cdots + x_{jr} \cdot e'_r$, with $x_{ji} \in B_{p_{ij}}$, let $p := \max\{p_{ij}\}$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq j \leq s$, then $f_j \in F_p(N)$, moreover, for every q, $B_{q-p} \cdot f_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_{q-p} \cdot f_s \subseteq B_{q-p} F_p(N) \subseteq F_q(N)$ (recall that for $k < 0$, $B_k = 0$); in turn, let $x \in F_q(N)$, then $x = b_1 \cdot f_1 + \cdots + b_s \cdot f_s$ and in $Gr(N)$ we have $\overline{x} \in Gr(N)_q$, $\overline{x} = \overline{b_1} \cdot \overline{f_1} + \cdots + \overline{b_s} \cdot \overline{f_s}$, if $b_j \in B_{u_j}$, let $u := \max\{u_j\}$, so $\overline{b_j} \cdot \overline{f_j} \in Gr(N)_{u+p}$, so $q = u + p$, i.e., $u = q - p$ and hence $x \in B_{q-p} \cdot f_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_{q-p} \cdot f_s$, Thus, we have proved that $B_{q-p} \cdot f_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_{q-p} \cdot f_s = F_q(N)$, for every q, and consequently, $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^s$ is a filtered basis of N. From this we conclude that $Gr(N)$ is graded-free with graded-basis $\{\overline{f_j}\}_{j=1}^s$, $\overline{f_j} := f_j + F_{p-1}(N)$.

We can repeat the previuos proof for the $\mathcal{IBN}$ property but assuming that f is an isomorphism. □

Theorem 2.9. *Let A be a skew PBW extension of a ring R. Then, A is $\mathcal{RC}$ ($\mathcal{IBN}$) if and only if R is $\mathcal{RC}$ ($\mathcal{IBN}$).*

Proof. We consider only the proof for $\mathcal{RC}$, the case $\mathcal{IBN}$ is completely analogous.

$\Rightarrow$): Since $R \hookrightarrow A$, if A is $\mathcal{RC}$, then R is $\mathcal{RC}$. In fact, let S and T be rings and let $S \xrightarrow{f} T$ be a ring homomorphism, if T is a $\mathcal{RC}$ ring then S is also a $\mathcal{RC}$ ring: T is a right S-module, $t \cdot s := tf(s)$; suppose that $S^r \xrightarrow{f} S^s$ is an epimorphism, then $T \otimes_S S^r \xrightarrow{i_T \otimes f} T \otimes_S S^s$ is also an epimorphism of left T-modules, i.e., we have an epimorphism $T^r \to T^s$, so $r \geq s$

$\Leftarrow$): We consider first the skew polynomial ring $R[x;\sigma]$ of endomorphism type, then $R[x;\sigma] \to R$ given by $p(x) \to p(0)$ is a ring homomorphism, so $R[x;\sigma]$ is $\mathcal{RC}$ since R is $\mathcal{RC}$. By Propositions 2.5 and 2.6, $Gr(A)$ is isomorphic to an iterated skew polynomial ring $R[z_1;\theta_1]\cdots[z_n;\theta_n]$, so $Gr(A)$ is $\mathcal{RC}$. Only rest to apply Lemma 2.8. □

3 d-Hermite rings and stable rank

There is a famous conjecture in commutative algebra that says that if R is a commutative $\mathcal{H}$-ring, then the polynomial ring $R[x]$ is $\mathcal{H}$ (see [6]). As we observed at the beginning of the paper, this conjecture for skew PBW extensions is not true. Another example is the skew polynomial ring $K[t][x;\sigma]$, with K a field and $\sigma(t) := t + 1$; in [12] is proved that $K[t][x;\sigma]$ is not $\mathcal{H}$ although $K[t]$ is $\mathcal{H}$. Thus, instead of considering the $\mathcal{H}$ condition and the conjecture for skew PBW extensions, we will study a weakly property, the d-Hermite property. The following proposition induces the definition of d-Hermite rings.

Proposition 3.1. *Let S be a ring. For any integer $d \geq 0$, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *Any stably free module of rank $\geq d$ is free.*

(ii) *Any unimodular row matrix over S of length $\geq d+1$ can be completed to an invertible matrix over S.*

(iii) *For every $r \geq d+1$, if $\boldsymbol{u}$ is an unimodular row matrix of size $1 \times r$, then there exists an invertible matrix $U \in GL_r(S)$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}U = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, i.e., the general linear group $GL_r(S)$ acts transitively on $Um_r(r, S)$.*

(iv) *For every $r \geq d+1$, given an unimodular matrix F of size $s \times r$, $r \geq s$, there exists $U \in GL_r(S)$ such that*

$$FU = \begin{bmatrix} I_s & | & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. We can repeat the proof of Theorem 2 in [8] taking $r \geq d+1$. □

Definition 3.2. *Let S be a ring and $d \geq 0$ an integer. S is d-Hermite, property denoted by d-$\mathcal{H}$, if S satisfies any of conditions in Proposition 3.1.*

Proposition 3.3. *The d-Hermite condition is left-right symmetric.*

Proof. We can repeat the proof of Proposition 9 in [8] taking $r \geq d+1$. See also [12], Lemma 11.1.13. □

Remark 3.4. (i) Observe that 0-Hermite rings coincide with $\mathcal{H}$ rings, and for commutative rings, 1-Hermite coincides also with $\mathcal{H}$ (see [6], Theorem I.4.11). If K is a field with $\text{char}(K) = 0$, by Corollary 4 in [8], $A_1(K)$ is 2-$\mathcal{H}$ but, as we observed at the beginning of the chapter, $A_1(K)$ is not 1-$\mathcal{H}$. In general, $\mathcal{H} \subsetneq 1\text{-}\mathcal{H} \subsetneq 2\text{-}\mathcal{H} \subsetneq \cdots$ (see [2]).

(ii) Note that $\mathcal{H} = 1\text{-}\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{WF}$ (a ring S is $\mathcal{WF}$, *weakly finite*, if for all $n \geq 0$, $P \oplus S^n \cong S^n$ if and only if $P = 0$).

Proposition 3.5. *Let S be a ring. Then, S is $\text{sr}(S)$-$\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. This follows from Definition 3.2 and Theorem 1.1. □

Corollary 3.6. *Let S be a ring. If $\text{sr}(S) = 1$, then S is $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 3.5, S is 1-$\mathcal{H}$, however, it is well known that rings with stable rank 1 are cancellable (see [3]), so by proposition 12 in [8], S is $\mathcal{H}$. □

Proposition 3.5 motivates the task of computing the stable rank of skew PBW extensions. For this purpose we need to recall the famous stable range theorem. This theorem relates the stable rank and the Krull dimension of a ring. The original version of this classical result is due a Bass (1968, [1]) and states that if S is a commutative Noetherian ring and $\text{Kdim}(S) = d$ then $\text{sr}(S) \leq d+1$. Heitmann extends the theorem for arbitrary commutative rings (1984, [5]). Lombardi et. al. in 2004 ([10], Theorem 2.4; see also [11]) proved again the theorem for arbitrary commutative rings using the Zariski lattice of a ring and the boundary ideal of an element. This proof is elementary and constructive. Stafford in 1981 ([14]) proved a noncommutative version of the theorem for left Noetherian rings.

Proposition 3.7 (Stable range theorem)**.** *Let S be a left Noetherian ring and $\text{lKdim}(S) = d$, then $\text{sr}(S) \leq d+1$.*

Proof. See [14]. □

From this we get the following result.

Theorem 3.8. *Let R be a left Noetherian ring with finite left Krull dimension and $A = \sigma(R)\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$ a bijective skew PBW extension of R, then*

$$1 \leq \mathrm{sr}(A) \leq \mathrm{lKdim}(R) + n + 1,$$

and A is d-$\mathcal{H}$, with $d := (\mathrm{lKdim}(R) + n + 1)$.

Proof. The inequalities follow from Proposition 3.7 and Theorem 4.2 in [9]. The second statement follows from Proposition 3.5. □

Example 3.9. The results in [9] for the Krull dimension of bijective skew PBW extensions can be combined with Theorem 3.8 in order to get an upper bound for the stable rank. With this we can estimate also the d-Hermite condition. The next table gives such estimations:

Ring	**U. B.**
Habitual polynomial ring $R[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$	$\dim(R) + n + 1$
Ore extension of bijective type $R[x_1; \sigma_1, \delta_1] \cdots [x_n; \sigma_n, \delta_n]$	$\dim(R) + n + 1$
Weyl algebra $A_n(K)$	$2n + 1$
Extended Weyl algebra $B_n(K)$	$n + 1$
Universal enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$, K commutative ring	$\dim(K) + n + 1$
Tensor product $R \otimes_K \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{G})$	$\dim(R) + n + 1$
Crossed product $R * \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{G})$	$\dim(R) + n + 1$
Algebra of q-differential operators $D_{q,h}[x, y]$	3
Algebra of shift operators S_h	3
Mixed algebra D_h	4
Discrete linear systems $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n][x_1, \sigma_1] \cdots [x_n; \sigma_n]$	$2n + 1$
Linear partial shift operators $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n][E_1, \ldots, E_n]$	$2n + 1$
Linear partial shift operators $K(t_1, \ldots, t_n)[E_1, \ldots, E_n]$	$n + 1$
L. P. Differential operators $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n][\partial_1, \ldots, \partial_n]$	$2n + 1$
L. P. Differential operators $K(t_1, \ldots, t_n)[\partial_1, \ldots, \partial_n]$	$n + 1$
L. P. Difference operators $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n][\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_n]$	$2n + 1$
L. P. Difference operators $K(t_1, \ldots, t_n)[\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_n]$	$n + 1$
L. P. q-dilation operators $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n][H_1^{(q)}, \ldots, H_m^{(q)}]$	$n + m + 1$
L. P. q-dilation operators $K(t_1, \ldots, t_n)[H_1^{(q)}, \ldots, H_m^{(q)}]$	$m + 1$
L. P. q-differential operators $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n][D_1^{(q)}, \ldots, D_m^{(q)}]$	$n + m + 1$
L. P. q-differential operators $K(t_1, \ldots, t_n)[D_1^{(q)}, \ldots, D_m^{(q)}]$	$m + 1$
Diffusion algebras	$2n + 1$
Additive analogue of the Weyl algebra $A_n(q_1, \ldots, q_n)$	$2n + 1$
Multiplicative analogue of the Weyl algebra $\mathcal{O}_n(\lambda_{ji})$	$n + 1$
Quantum algebra $\mathcal{U}'(\mathfrak{so}(3, K))$	4
3-dimensional skew polynomial algebras	4
Dispin algebra $\mathcal{U}(osp(1, 2))$	4
Woronowicz algebra $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathfrak{sl}(2, K))$	4
Complex algebra $V_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}))$	11
Algebra $\mathbf{U}$	$3n + 1$
Manin algebra $\mathcal{O}_q(M_2(K))$	5
Coordinate algebra of the quantum group $SL_q(2)$	5
q-Heisenberg algebra $\mathbf{H}_n(q)$	$3n + 1$
Quantum enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, K)$, $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, K))$	4
Hayashi algebra $\mathcal{W}_q(J)$	$3n + 1$
Differential operators on a quantum space $S_{\mathbf{q}}$, $D_{\mathbf{q}}(S_{\mathbf{q}})$	$2n + 1$
Witten's Deformation of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{sl}(2, K)$	4
Quantum Weyl algebra of Maltsiniotis $A_n^{\mathbf{q},\lambda}$, K commutative ring	$\dim(K) + 2n + 1$
Quantum Weyl algebra $A_n(q, p_{i,j})$	$2n + 1$
Multiparameter Weyl algebra $A_n^{Q,\mathbf{t}}(K)$	$2n + 1$
Quantum symplectic space $\mathcal{O}_q(\mathfrak{sp}(K^{2n}))$	$2n + 1$
Quadratic algebras in 3 variables	4

Table 1: Stable rank for some examples of bijective skew PBW extensions.

4 Kronecker's theorem

Close related to the stable range theorem is the Kronecker's theorem staying that if S is a commutative ring with $\mathrm{Kdim}(S) < d$, then every finitely generated ideal I of S has the same radical as an ideal generated by d elements. In this section we want to investigate this theorem for noncommutative rings using the Zariski lattice and the boundary ideal, but generalizing these tools and its properties to noncommutative rings. The main result will be applied to skew PBW extensions.

Definition 4.1. *Let S be a ring and $Spec(S)$ the set of all prime ideals of S. The Zariski lattice of S is defined by*

$$Zar(S) := \{D(X) | X \subseteq S\}, \text{ with } D(X) := \bigcap_{X \subseteq P \in Spec(S)} P.$$

$Zar(S)$ is ordered with respect the inclusion. The description of the Zariski lattice is presented in the next proposition, $\langle X\}, \langle X\rangle, \{X\rangle$ will represents the left, two-sided, and right ideal of S generated by X, respectively. $\vee$ denotes the sup and $\wedge$ the inf.

Proposition 4.2. *Let S be a ring, I, I_1, I_2, I_3 two-sided ideals of S, $X \subseteq S$, and $x_1, \ldots, x_n, x, y \in S$. Then,*

(i) $D(X) = D(\langle X\}) = D(\langle X\rangle) = D(\{X\rangle)$.

(ii) $D(I) = rad(S)$ *if and only if* $I \subseteq rad(S)$. *In particular,* $D(0) = rad(S)$.

(iii) $D(I) = S$ *if and only if* $I = S$.

(iv) $I \subseteq D(I)$ *and* $D(D(I)) = D(I)$. *Moreover, if* $I_1 \subseteq I_2$, *then* $D(I_1) \subseteq D(I_2)$.

(v) *Let* $\{I_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ *a family of two-sided ideals of* S. *Then,* $D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j) = \vee_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j)$. *In particular,* $D(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = D(x_1) \vee \cdots \vee D(x_n)$.

(vi) $D(I_1I_2) = D(I_1) \wedge D(I_2)$. *In particular,* $D(\langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle) = D(x) \wedge D(y)$.

(vii) $D(x + y) \subseteq D(x, y)$.

(viii) *If* $\langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle \subseteq D(0)$, *then* $D(x, y) = D(x + y)$.

(ix) *If* $x \in D(I)$, *then* $D(I) = D(I, x)$.

(x) *If* $\overline{S} := S/I$, *then* $D(\overline{J}) = \overline{D(J)}$, *for any two-sided ideal* J *of* S *containing* I.

(xi) $u \in D(I)$ *if and only if* $\overline{u} \in rad(S/I)$. *In such case, if* $u \in D(I)$, *there exists* $k \geq 1$ *such that* $u^k \in I$.

(xii) $Zar(S)$ *is distributive:*

$$D(I_1) \wedge [D(I_2) \vee D(I_3)] = [D(I_1) \wedge D(I_2)] \vee [D(I_1) \wedge D(I_3)],$$
$$D(I_1) \vee [D(I_2) \wedge D(I_3)] = [D(I_1) \vee D(I_2)] \wedge [D(_1) \vee D(I_3)].$$

Proof. (i), (ii), (iv), (ix) and (x) are evident from the definitions.

(iii) If $I = S$ there is no prime ideal containing I, so the intersection of prime ideals containing I is taken equals S (see [4], p. 51). Conversely, if $I \neq S$ the intersection of proper ideals containing I is proper (this collection is not empty since I is contained in at least one prime ideal), thus $D(I) \neq S$.

(v) We prove first that $\vee_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j) = D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j))$: for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, $D(I_j) \subseteq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j) \subseteq D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j))$; let $D(I) \supseteq D(I_j)$ for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, then $D(I) \supseteq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j)$ and hence $D(I) = D(D(I)) \supseteq D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j))$.

Only rest to show that $D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j)) = D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j)$: from $I_j \subseteq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j$ we get $D(I_j) \subseteq D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j)$, so $D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j) \supseteq \vee_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j) = D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j))$; on the other hand, $D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j)) \supseteq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j) \supseteq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j$, so $D(D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j))) \supseteq D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j)$, thus $D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} D(I_j)) \supseteq D(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} I_j)$.

(vi) It is clear that $D(I_1I_2) \subseteq D(I_1), D(I_2)$. Let I be a two-side ideal of S such that $D(I) \subseteq D(I_1), D(I_2)$, then $D(I) \subseteq D(I_1) \cap D(I_2) \subseteq D(I_1I_2)$. The last inclusion follows from the fact that if P is a prime ideal containing I_1I_2, then $I_1 \subseteq P$ or $I_2 \subseteq P$, thus if $x \in D(I_1) \cap D(I_2)$, then $x \in P$, i.e., $x \in D(I_1I_2)$. This implies that $D(I_1) \wedge D(I_2) = D(I_1I_2)$.

(vii) Since $\langle x + y\rangle \subseteq \langle x, y\rangle$, then the result follows from (iv).

(viii) According to (vii), $D(x + y) \subseteq D(x, y)$; for the other inclusion note first that $D(x, y) = D(x + y, \langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle)$: the inclusion $D(x + y, \langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle) \subseteq D(x, y)$ is clear since any prime containing x, y contains $x + y, \langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle$. Let P a prime that contains $x + y, \langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle$, so $x \in P$ or $y \in P$, in the first case $x \in P$ and $y \in P$ and the same is true in the second case. This implies that $D(x, y) \subseteq D(x + y, \langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle)$.

By the hypothesis and numeral (ii), $\langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle \subseteq rad(S)$, i.e., $\langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle$ is contained in all primes, so $D(x+y, \langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle) = D(x+y)$ and hence $D(x,y) = D(x+y)$.

(xi) The first assertion is clear from the definition of $D(I)$ and $rad(S/I)$. If $u \in D(I)$, then $\overline{u} \in rad(S/I)$ and hence $\overline{u}$ is strongly nilpotent, but this implies that $\overline{u}$ is nilpotent (see [12]), i.e., there exists $k \geq 1$ such that $\overline{u}^k = \overline{0}$, i.e., $u^k \in I$.

(xii) For the first identity we have:

$$D(I_1) \wedge [D(I_2) \vee D(I_3)] = D(I_1) \wedge D(I_2 + I_3) = D[I_1(I_2 + I_3)] = D(I_1I_2 + I_1I_3) = D(I_1I_2) \vee D(I_1I_3) = [D(I_1) \wedge D(I_2)] \vee [D(I_1) \wedge D(I_3].$$

For the second relation we have

$$D(I_1) \vee [D(_2) \wedge D(I_3)] = D(I_1) \vee D(I_2I_3) = D(I_1 + I_2I_3) \supseteq D[(I_1 + I_2)(I_1 + I_3)] = [D(I_1) \vee D(I_2)] \wedge [D(I_1) \vee D(I_3)];$$

the other inclusion follows from the fact that $D(I_1 + I_2I_3) \subseteq D[(I_1 + I_2)(I_1 + I_3)]$ since if P is a prime ideal that contains $(I_1+I_2)(I_1+I_3)$, then $P \supseteq (I_1+I_2)$ or $P \supseteq (I_1+I_3)$, thus $P \supseteq I_1$ and $P \supseteq I_2 \supseteq I_2I_3$, or, $P \supseteq I_1$ and $P \supseteq I_3 \supseteq I_2I_3$, i.e., $P \supseteq I_1 + I_2I_3$. □

Definition 4.3. *Let S be a ring and $v \in S$, the boundary ideal of v is defined by $I_v := \langle v\rangle + (D(0) : \langle v\rangle)$, where $(D(0) : \langle v\rangle) := \{x \in S | \langle v\rangle x \subseteq D(0)\}$.*

Note that $I_v \neq 0$ for every $v \in S$. On the other hand, if v is invertible or if $v = 0$, then $I_v = S$. If S a domain and $v \neq 0$, then $I_v = \langle v\rangle$.

Definition 4.4. *Let S be a ring such that* $\mathrm{lKdim}(S)$ *exists. We say the S satisfies the boundary condition if for any $d \geq 0$ and every $v \in S$,*

$$\mathrm{lKdim}(S) \leq d \Rightarrow \mathrm{lKdim}(S/I_v) \leq d - 1.$$

Example 4.5. (i) Any commutative Noetherian ring satisfies the boundary condition: Indeed, for commutative Noetherian rings, the classical Krull dimension and the Krull dimension coincide, so we can apply Theorem 13.2 in [11].

(ii) Any prime ring S with left Krull dimension satisfies the boundary condition: In fact, for prime rings, any non-zero two sided ideal is essential, so $\mathrm{lKdim}(S/I_v) < \mathrm{lKdim}(S)$ (see [12], Proposition 6.3.10).

(iii) Any domain with left Krull dimension satisfies the satisfies the boundary condition: Indeed, any domain is a prime ring.

Lemma 4.6 (Kronecker)**.** *Let S be a domain such that* $\mathrm{lKdim}(S)$ *exists. If* $\mathrm{lKdim}(S) < d$ *and $u_1, \ldots, u_d, u \in S$, then there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_d \in S$ such that*

$$D(u_1, \ldots, u_d, u) = D(u_1 + x_1u, \ldots, u_d + x_du).$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on d. Let $d = 1$ and $u_1, u \in S$, if $\mathrm{lKdim}(S) = -1$, then by definition $S = 0$ and $u_1, u = 0$, so we take $x_1 := 0$. Let $\mathrm{lKdim}(S) = 0$; by the boundary condition, $\mathrm{lKdim}(S/I_{u_1}) = -1$, i.e., $S = I_{u_1} = \langle u_1\rangle + (D(0) : \langle u_1\rangle)$. There exist $c_1, c_1', \ldots, c_l, c_l' \in S$ and $x_1 \in (D(0) : \langle u_1\rangle)$ such that $1 = c_1u_1c_1' + \cdots + c_lu_1c_l' + x_1$, then $\langle u_1\rangle\langle x_1\rangle \subseteq D(0)$ and $u = c_1u_1c_1'u + \cdots + c_lu_1c_l'u + x_1u$, thus $u \in \langle u_1, x_1u\rangle$ and hence $u \in D(u_1, x_1u)$ (Proposition 4.2, part (iv)). Moreover, $\langle u_1\rangle\langle x_1u\rangle \subseteq D(0)$, then by Proposition 4.2, part (viii), $D(u_1, x_1u) = D(u_1 + x_1u)$. Thus, $u \in D(u_1 + x_1u)$, so $D(u_1 + x_1u) = D(u_1 + x_1u, u)$ (Proposition 4.2, part (ix)), but $D(u_1 + x_1u, u) = D(u_1, u)$ since $\langle u_1 + x_1u, u\rangle = \langle u_1, u\rangle$, so $D(u_1, u) = D(u_1 + x_1u)$.

Now we assume that the proposition is true for rings with left Krull dimension $< d - 1$, $d \geq 2$, and let S be a ring with $\mathrm{lKdim}(S) < d$. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_d, u \in S$. We consider two cases.

Case 1. If $u_d = 0$, then the theorem is trivial with $x_1 = \cdots = x_{d-1} = 0$, $x_d = 1$.

Case 2. Let $u_d \neq 0$. Let I be the boundary ideal of u_d, then $D(I) = \langle u_d\rangle$. We consider the elements $\overline{u_1}, \ldots, \overline{u_{d-1}}, \overline{u} \in \overline{S}$, with $\overline{S} := S/I$. By the hypothesis, $\mathrm{lKdim}(\overline{S}) < d - 1$ and hence there exist elements $\overline{x_1}, \ldots, \overline{x_{d-1}} \in \overline{S}$ such that $D(\overline{u_1}, \ldots, \overline{u_{d-1}}, \overline{u}) = D(\overline{u_1} + \overline{x_1}\,\overline{u}, \ldots, \overline{u_{d-1}} + \overline{x_{d-1}}\,\overline{u})$. From this we get that

$$D(\overline{\langle u_1,\ldots,u_{d-1},u\rangle + I}) = D(\overline{\langle u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u\rangle + I}),$$

but by Proposition 4.2, part (x),

$$\overline{D(\langle u_1,\ldots,u_{d-1},u\rangle + I)} = \overline{D(\langle u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u\rangle + I)}, \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$D(\langle u_1,\ldots,u_{d-1},u\rangle + I) = D(\langle u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u\rangle + I).$$

Since $u \in \langle u_1,\ldots,u_{d-1},u\rangle + I \subseteq D(\langle u_1,\ldots,u_{d-1},u\rangle + I)$, then $u \in D(\langle u_1+x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u\rangle + I) = D(\langle u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u) \vee D(I) = D(\langle u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u, u_d)$. Taking $x_d := 0$ we get that $u \in D(u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u, u_d + x_du)$. From this, and using Proposition 4.2, part (ix), we conclude that

$$D(u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u, u_d + x_du) = D(u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u, u_d + x_du, u)$$

however note that

$$\langle u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u, u_d + x_du, u\rangle = \langle u_1,\ldots,u_{d-1},u_d,u\rangle,$$

so $D(u_1 + x_1u,\ldots,u_{d-1}+x_{d-1}u, u_d + x_du) = D(u_1,\ldots,u_{d-1},u_d,u)$. □

Corollary 4.7. *Let S be a domain such that $\mathrm{lKdim}(S)$ exists. If $\mathrm{lKdim}(S) < d$ and $u_1,\ldots,u_{d+1} \in S$ are such that $\langle u_1,\ldots,u_{d+1}\rangle = S$, then there exist elements $x_1,\ldots,x_d \in S$ such that $\langle u_1 + x_1u_{d+1},\ldots,u_d + x_du_{d+1}\rangle = S$.*

Proof. The statement follows directly from Proposition 4.2, part (iii), and Lemma 4.6. □

Theorem 4.8. *Let $A = \sigma(R)\langle x_1,\ldots,x_n\rangle$ be a bijective skew PBW extension of a left Noetherian domain R. If $\mathrm{lKdim}(R) < d$ and $u_1,\ldots,u_{d+n},u \in A$, then there exist $y_1,\ldots,y_{d+n} \in A$ such that*

$$D(u_1,\ldots,u_{d+n},u) = D(u_1 + y_1u,\ldots,u_{d+n} + y_{d+n}u).$$

Proof. This follows directly from Propositions 2.4 and 2.7, Theorem 4.2 in [9], and Lemma 4.6. □

References

[1] **Bass, H.**, *Algebraic K-theory*, Benjamin, 1968.

[2] **Cohn, P.**, *Free Ideal Rings and Localizations in General Rings*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[3] **Evans, E. G. Jr.**, *Krull-Schmidt and cancellation over local rings*, Pacific J. Math. 46, 1973, 115-121.

[4] **Goodearl, K. and Warfield, R. Jr.**, *An Introduction to Non-commutative Noetherian Rings*, London Mathematical Society, ST 61, 2004.

[5] **Heitmann, R.**, *Generating non-Noetherian modules efficiently*, Michigan Math. J., 31, 1984, 167-180.

[6] **Lam, T.Y.**, *Serre's Problem on Projective Modules* , Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, 2006.

[7] **Lezama, O. and Gallego, C.**, *Gröbner bases for ideals of sigma-PBW extensions*, Communications in Algebra, 39 (1), 2011, 50-75.

[8] **Lezama, O. and Gallego, C.**, *Matrix approach to noncommutative stably free modules and Hermite rings*, to appear in Algebra and Discrete Mathematics.

[9] **Lezama, O. & Reyes, M.**, *Some homological properties of skew PBW extensions*, Comm. in Algebra, 42, (2014), 1200-1230.

[10] **Coquand, T., Lombardi, H. and Quitté, C.**, *Generating non-noetherian modules constructively*, Manuscripta Math. 115, 2004, 513-520.

[11] **Lombardi, H and Quitté, C.**, *Algèbre Commutative, Méthodes constructives: Modules projectifs de type fini*, preprint, 2010.

[12] **McConnell, J. and Robson, J.**, *Non-commutative Noetherian Rings*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, AMS, 2001.

[13] **Quadrat, A., Robertz, D.**, *Computation of bases of free modules over the Weyl algebras*, J. Symb. Comp., 42, 2007, 1113-1141.

[14] **Stafford, J.T.**, *On the stable range of right Noetherian rings*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 13, 1981, 39-41.